



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



TRANSPORTATION LIBRARY



1. 1

( )

1. 4









King Edward the Third's Chapel Wakefield.



A  
**DISSERTATION**

ON ANCIENT  
**BRIDGES AND BRIDGE CHAPELS,**

AND ESPECIALLY  
THAT REMARKABLE EDIFICE ON WAKEFIELD BRIDGE,

COMMONLY, BUT ERRONEOUSLY, CALLED

**The Chapel of Edward the Fourth.**

---

BY NORRISSON SCATCHERD, Esq.

---

"Mani excellent Notes, though some thinges, walenge the tyme, may be  
"amendid.—Rede, Judge,—and thank God for a better light."

*Illuminated MS of a Monk, in Corpus Christi Coll. Cambridge.*

---

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR LONGMAN, REES, ORME, BROWN, AND  
GREEN; AND SOLD BY J. HEATON, JUN. LEEDS;  
MRS. HURST, WAKEFIELD; N. WHITLEY,  
HALIFAX; AND ALL BOOKSELLERS.

1828.

TRANSPORTATION LIBRARY

DA

690

, W14

53

Godfrey  
8-19-38

Transport.  
transf. to Gen. Lib.

## PREFACE.

---

MANY of my acquaintance may perhaps be surprised at perceiving my pen engaged upon such subjects as the following; but those who know my particular predilection for our national Antiquities and History, will think differently.— Writing, as I do, for the amusement of a leisure hour, it will appear, to them, very natural, that I should choose a discussion the most agreeable to my fancy, and not unlikely, from its novelty, to be generally acceptable. To render it more so, I have studiously consulted brevity, and have not been quite inattentive to other requisites. Had my thoughts been turning upon profit, assuredly this trifle would have been swelled into a great book—to compile which, upon the usual plan, is the most easy thing imaginable. This, however, is a kind of drudgery to which I cannot descend, and I am truly thankful at having no very strong temptation.

Morley, 1st of December, 1827.

Ms. 15-61-3W



## DISSERTATION, &c.

---

IN past ages of the world, as well as in the present, so many people have made pretensions to taste, upon antiquarian subjects, and so few have possessed the enterprise, and patience, and perseverance, of a real antiquary; so many have depended upon the "reports" of others, and so few have travelled, and seen, and examined for themselves; and the mistakes committed are, consequently, so frequent, that of all other persons, the antiquary has the most occasion to be suspicious and mistrustful in the prosecution of his studies.

Besides the foregoing, there is another observation which I have frequently made, and it is this:—Many gentlemen who really are interested on the subject of our antiquities, can view curiosities, and read accounts of them, without asking themselves those questions—without discovering those latent peculiarities, without making, in a word, those happy and dexterous hits which may be regarded as the "Tact" and "Test" of a true antiquary.

One of the greatest curiosities which the county of York can boast, is, beyond all controversy, the beautiful and interesting Chapel upon Wakefield bridge. But who cares about that little antiquated Chapel? Who that knows any thing of its history but believes, implicitly, what he may have seen in print concerning it? Who imagines it possible that he can have been misled by the "fallacies

of authority," when such names as those of Leland, Holgate, Gent, and Whitaker appear? But, above all, whoever put to himself this singular question—Why a Chapel upon a Bridge?

Before I enter upon this, which will, by many be regarded as the most interesting part of my present communication, I must, for making it complete, inform the reader, what the chief writers on our local history have told us concerning the Chapel in question.

Leland, who wrote in the reign of Henry the 8th, states; that there was then "a Chapel of our LADY upon Calder Bridge, wont to be celebrated a peregrinis;" and again he says, "These things I especially noted in Wakefield, the faire Bridge of Nine Arches under which rennith the River Calder, and on the Est side of this Bridge is a right goodly Chapel of our LADY and two Cantuarie Priests founded in it, of the fundacion of THE TOWNSMEN, as SOME SAY, but the Dukes of York were taken as Foundirs for obteyning the Mortmayn. I HEARD ONE SAY that a Servant of King Edwardes the 4th Father, or els of the Erle of Rutland, Brother to King Edwd. the Fourth, was a great Doer of it. There was a sore Batell fought in the South Feildes by the Bridge, and, in the flite of the Duke of York's parte, other the Duke himself or his Sun, therle of Rutland, was slain a little above the Barres beyond the Bridge, going up a elyving ground. At this place is set up a Crosse in Memoriam. The commune saying is there that the erle wold have taken ther a poore Woman's House for socour, and she for fere shet the dore and strait the erle was killed."

I cannot help thinking that, for any thing which appears upon the face of this statement, the Chapel was as likely

to have been of the foundation of the Townsmen as not.— The whole of it is, at best, “but hearsay,” and tittle tattle related by one who evidently had made no research, but took what was told him UPON TRUST. That a servant\* of Edward’s father, had some concern in the building or beautifying of the Chapel is just possible, for he might have been one of these “Townsmen;” and, by his means, the Dukes of York may both have obtained the Mortmain and credit of having founded this structure. But, that they were the Founders is, I think, disputable on several grounds.

This Chapel is said to have been built to pray therein for the souls of those who fell at the Battle of Sandal Field, called the Battle of Wakefield, though at some distance therefrom. Now it is manifest, from all accounts, that it was fought near Sandal Castle, and not Wakefield, which is above two miles from that place, and on the opposite side of the river; but Wakefield, being the largest town in the vicinity, and the battle being thence called “the Battle of Wakefield,” a delusion has been encouraged during the long period of nearly three centuries. That such has been the case, however, I infer from the following circumstances.

In the first place it seems rational to suppose that if Edward the 4th did build a Chapel for the purpose before mentioned, he would erect it on some part of the field of battle; and that such was the usage of his times, I will give the best of all possible instances.† After the battle

\* Perhaps this person might be “Rauf Stanley” mentioned in some of our old chronicles, an adherent to the house of York.

† Note another instance hereinafter mentioned, with reference to the Chapel on Ousebridge. Page 23.

of Towton it is well known that Richard the Third built or began a chapel, for the souls of the Yorkists who there fell. And where did he build it? Over the Wharf? or over the Ouse at York? or upon "Cokbeck?" No! but as is very natural to conclude,—where the soldiers died; that is upon the ground which covered their remains,\* or that part of the field which is the furthest from Saxton.

But, secondly, if Edward, contrary to custom, determined to build his Chapel remote from the ashes of the slain, and upon a bridge, it seems evident, at all events, that we should find it at the South end of the bridge, at least, that is to say at the end nearest to the field of battle; but what is the fact? Why, that this Chapel is situate much nearer to the opposite end.

Waiving my other objections and arguments at present, that they may be introduced in their proper place, I proceed with Dr. Whitaker's remark upon Leland's narrative.

"With respect to the beautiful Chapel on the Bridge," says he, "beautiful even after the botchwork by which it has been attempted to be repaired, so early and authoritative a testimony, as that of Archbishop Holgate, must go far towards establishing the fact that it was FOUNDED by Edward, Duke of York, afterwards Edward the 4th. I am willing also to be persuaded that this endowment took place in order, as is generally supposed, to pray for the souls of the slain in the battle of Wakefield; and especially of poor little Rutland. The architecture of the rich facade, at least, is unquestionably of that age, but it is equally certain that there was a Chantry on this bridge of a much earlier date—for, by charter dated at

---

\* Leland



“ Wakefield, A.D. 1357, (31st Edwd. 3d.) and copied by  
 “ Mr. Hopkinson into his collections, it appears, that the  
 “ said King vested a rent charge of ten pounds per ann. on  
 “ Wm. Kaye and Wm. Bull, chaplains, and their succes-  
 “ sors for ever, to perform divine service daily in the  
 “ Chapel of St. MARY, THEN NEWLY ERECTED on Wake-  
 “ field bridge.”

“ By a later account which I have seen, the LATER  
 “ CHANTRY OF TWO PRIESTS said to be endowed by  
 “ Edward Duke of York, was valued at £14. 15s. 3½d.  
 “ I am unable to reconcile the difference between this sum  
 “ and £8. 10s. 3d. but the vicinity of the bridge to the  
 “ ground where the former Duke of York and little Rutland  
 “ fell, and especially the title assumed by the founder  
 “ which in the following year was merged in the style of  
 “ king, renders it in the highest degree probable, that  
 “ this Chapel was RE-ENDOWED by that prince IMMEDI-  
 “ ATELY AFTER THE BATTLE, and for a purpose which  
 “ his feelings would then dictate to him as charitable and  
 “ pious. I wish the perishing SCULPTURES ON THE FRONT  
 “ could be discovered, to throw ANY LIGHT ON THE  
 “ SUBJECT.”

That the reader may understand these remarks of  
 Whitaker I must MENTION, that, in the preceding page,  
 he gives us the report of Archbishop Holgate concerning  
 the chantries in Wakefield and its parish, which appear to  
 have been nine in number, and one of them, “ the chantrie  
 “ of two priests in THE MIDDLE of Wakefield bridge,”  
 “ founded,” says Holgate, “ by Edward Duke of York,  
 “ and valued at £8. 10s. 3d.”

With respect to the “ early and authoritative testimony”  
 of Holgate I have to remark, that being translated to the

See of York, so late as 1544, *i. e.* only about three years before the death of Henry 8th, it could not be much earlier than that of his contemporary Leland, and it probably was later; besides which, if the account of him given by Drake be correct, he had many affairs upon his hands to abstract him from deep researches into our national antiquities. That he might know something of the "*Anachoreta in Media Urbe unde et aliquando inventa fœcunda,*" is very likely; but that he had any better information than Leland about the Bridge Chapel is not at all so.\* We do not know that he had any taste for antiquarian subjects; but we do know that, like many of his cloth, he was a busy, intriguing, worldly minded man—a perpetual dabbler in politics, and a courtier. In short, as his brief notice respecting Wakefield Bridge Chapel, comes to us in a way no more authentic than that of Leland, we may well conjecture that he came by his news in a similar way.

As to Gent—and indeed all other historians and topographers since the days of Leland and Holgate; as they seem to have believed their report without enquiry, and to have re-echoed it without further evidence, I shall notice none of them but Whitaker; and him only on account of his singular commentary.

If I understand the Drs. meaning in the foregoing extract, his opinion (grounded on the report of Holgate) was, that Edward the 4th, while Duke of York, and IMMEDIATELY AFTER the battle of Sandal, founded and

---

\* Leland was born in 1507, afterwards appointed librarian to Henry 8th, and had authority to search the kingdom for ancient writings, &c. In 1542 he returned from his antiquarian tour, and published about seven years afterwards.

endowed the Bridge Chapel on account of those Yorkists who fell at that time, and, especially, poor little Rutland; but then he tells us, in conclusion, that it is highly probable he RE-ENDOWED IT IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE BATTLE; from which one would think his opinion was that Edward founded and endowed the Chapel before the battle, and re-endowed it afterwards,—but, if so, it could not have been BUILT for the purpose which all the forementioned authorities assert. And as to saying that Edward built and endowed, and re-endowed IT IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE FIGHT, WHAT DOES IT SOUND LIKE?

But notwithstanding the Drs. reverence for Archbishop Holgate, he seems to have been startled and confounded by two very awkward circumstances—one of them the undoubted existence of a chantry on this bridge so early as 1357 (31st Edw. 3d)—the other, the discrepancy between the sum of £8. 10s. 3d. and £14. 15s. 3d. difficulties which, by the way, as far as the main question is considered, his gratuitous supposition of re-endowment goes but a little way to rectify. Finding himself therefore in a labyrinth, and completely in the dark, he calls for a light—"I wish (says he) the "perishing sculptures on the front could be discovered to "throw ANY LIGHT upon the subject."

Unless, I am, myself, misled by an "Ignis fatuus," I think I can supply a light in this instance.—It may indeed be the light of a taper, but it will enable us to make out most of these sculptures; and whether I am right or not in my hypothesis (hereafter to be mentioned) it will shew, as I trust, pretty clearly, that Dr. W. and his authorities were "all in the wrong."

But to enable the reader to form a sound opinion he should visit this Chapel and see and examine for himself, attending particularly to three things :—

- 1st. The fragments of images still remaining on the front.
- 2d. To the bridge—especially its arches.
- 3d. Whether the Chapel is incorporated with the bridge, or seems an integral structure added thereto—and
- 4th. To its architecture.

As to the first point I would appeal to any one whether the lower part of twelve figures apparently sitting, and still distinctly VISIBLE IN THE THIRD COMPARTMENT, as the visitor leaves Wakefield, have not been those of the twelve Apostles over whom probably, there has been a figure for Christ, now completely gone. On one side there are two figures probably for David and Solomon, as they seem like kings, and on the other side is a woman, in a reclining posture, with part of another figure, seemingly a female, and possibly representing St. Ann\* with the Virgin Mary, her daughter. As to the other two designs, that next Wakefield has been long removed, and the other I cannot guess at.

But now for the proofs—now for the developement—now for the light which the Doctor called for, and which it was his business to have found.

In casting my eyes over the *Gentleman's Magazine*, for the year 1756, (vol. 26) I lately found a most curious and interesting paper by the celebrated Dr. Pegge, who must ever be accounted an antiquary of the first class. He tells us, that, in the month of May in that year, there were found in the roof of a SMALL CHAPEL at Wakefield, in Yorkshire, a large number of figures—some in alabaster, and some in wood, richly ornamented with painting and

---

\* I incline however to think that these have been figures for Adam and Eve, from the apparent state of nudity in which the woman reclining is SCULPTURED. One writer says they represent the Nativity, Resurrection, and Ascension.—*Gentleman's Mag.* for 1806, p. 723.

gilding, "and VERY ANTIQUE. The figures," says he, "are attended with their proper attributes, to distinguish them one from another, and to betoken to us the persons whom they respectively represent. This," he adds, "is a requisite which undoubtedly makes it the more valuable, since otherwise, at this distance of time," for they have lain as long concealed as since the reign of KING HENRY 8TH, and are, NO DOUBT IN THEMSELVES MUCH OLDER, we should have been greatly at a loss to have known to whom each figure appertained.

After clearly demonstrating that one of these figures in alabaster was designed to represent St. William, the 30th Archbishop of York, he relates this anecdote by way of illustration from Drake's York.

"At his entrance (i. e. St. William's) into York, A.D. 1154, he wrought a very notable miracle, for the wooden bridge over the Ouse, breaking down by means of the number of people upon it, St. William, as the story goes, fell down instantly upon his knees and obtained by his prayers, the life of every individual person. And thereupon I suppose after his death and canonization, he had a chapel erected to his honour upon the bridge at York."

In conclusion, Dr. Pegge proceeds as follows "This in brief, Sir, is the account which a very good antiquarian has given us of this eminent prelate, whose effigies we are now contemplating; to which I shall only add, that, according to my information the other figures of this collection ARE EQUALLY BEAUTIFUL with this, especially the alabaster ones—one of which is very large, and represents St. Ann, the mother of the Virgin Mary teaching the young virgin to read—and the other, two saints under

“the act of M artyrdom—This is a group of fifteen figures  
 “in alto relievo—There are in all I find no less than twenty-  
 “five different pieces, chiefly taken out of the Old Testa-  
 “ment and the New, &c.”

Another correspondent with the Editor of the *Gentleman’s Magazine*, who signs his name “Cantianus”, in the Magazine for June, 1759, says—“The antique figures that  
 “were discovered in the roof of A SMALL CHAPEL at  
 “Wakefield, in Yorkshire, in May, 1756, and the year  
 “following, publickly shewn in London, excited my curio-  
 “sity to take a view of them, particularly that of St.  
 “William, the 30th Archbishop of York, most accurately  
 “explained by the learned and ingenious Mr. Paul Gemsege.”  
 What follows has nothing to do with my argument, and I  
 only quote the foregoing passage to shew that, according to  
 this learned antiquary, as well as Dr. Pegge, the figures  
 were found IN THE ROOF OF THE CHAPEL.\*

Gough, in his *British Topography*, says, vol. 2, p. 438 ;  
 “In the *Gentleman’s Magazine* for December, 1756, p.  
 “599, is an account of a great number of groups in wood  
 “and alabaster, found that spring, in the roof of a house in  
 “the market place of the town, with a drawing of one  
 “representing St. William, Archbishop of York, by Mr.  
 “Pegge, &c.—These figures were shewn about the country  
 “at fairs, and afterwards in London, in 1759. A printed  
 “account of them circulated soon after their discovery, says  
 “—that they were supposed to have belonged to Sandal

---

\* “In the middle ages the makers of images used to go to a priest, con-  
 “fess, do penance—make a vow of fasting, prayer, or pilgrimage, and solicit  
 “the priest to pray for them, before they attempted to make an image.  
 “The makers carried them to the fairs for sale—They were bought to  
 “put INTO ORATORIES.”

"Wakefield," says Leland, "stondeth now al by clothyng"—and, again "Al the hole profite of the towne stondeth by "course draperie"—and what do the statutes of Edward the Third tell us?

Turn reader to these acts,\* especially 9 Edw. 3. cap. 1. 11 Edw. 3. c. 2.—25 Edw. 3. c. 4. and 2 & 27 Edw. 3. c. 4. and judge for yourself, which will be better than pinning your faith upon the sleeve of any person whatever, and you shall find, how this Edward promoted trade and commerce, especially the woollen manufactures, by giving protection and encouragement to foreign merchants and weavers, by prohibiting every one from wearing cloth not of English fabric—by opening a free trade with other countries—by improving the navigation of rivers—by fixing the staple goods of England, such as wool, woolfels, leather, tin, and lead, &c. in our principal cities,† and thereby bringing the markets home to Englishmen; by affording them security against THE INSOLENCIE AND TYRANNY OF MEN IN OFFICE, and the knavery of merchant strangers, and, in short, by various other acts, all tending to the public good, and to the prosperity and happiness of the lower orders in particular. Under circumstances such as these is it not natural to suppose that the clothing towns, such as Wakefield, would rejoice?—would build a better Bridge and a Chapel, and give the latter to the King?

Here then we see how the mortmain of this Chapel came into the hands of the Crown, as well as the æra and cause

\* See further 4 Edw. 3. c. 14.—11 Edw. 3. c. 5.—18 Edw. 3. c. 3.—31 Edw. 3. c. 15.

† "Anno reg. 27 Ed. 3d. The staple of wool which had before been kept at Bridges (Bruges), in Flanders, by Act of Parliament was fixed at York, and some other places in England."—*Drake* 229.

of its foundation, We restore a beautiful structure of Edward the 3d reign, and existing, without doubt, BEFORE 1357; but which Dr. Whitaker has lost. We give the honour of it to the people of Wakefield, as founders thereof, even upon the report of Leland. We shew the cause of Leland's "hear say" and Holgate's ignorance (since if the Chapel was only about 82 years old when he saw it, there could have been no doubt—no "hear say"—amongst the oldest inhabitants). We shew how the fourth Edward came to be accounted its founder. We prove from its situation at the North end of the bridge, and the perishing sculptures of its rich facade,\* that it had no relation whatever to the battle of Sandal; and that the endowment of it by this Edward, and the erection of a cross† upon the field of battle, is all that can be, properly, attributed to him.

Thus far, and indeed somewhat farther, had I proceeded in the discussion of my subject, when, upon turning into *Whitaker's History of Craven*, I accidentally, and very fortunately discovered the following note in page 20 of that work;—Writing upon "the Lacy Fee in the Parish of Mitton" the Doctor says, "Yet there was a William 'de Bayley possessed of property within the parish as late 'as 1391; for in that year he bequeaths, besides many 'other legacies to religious houses, &c. 'Unum Equum 'vet equam, quem, vel quam, Vicar de Mitton, vult 'eligere.' One item in the will is entitled to notice, as it 'contradicts A RECEIVED OPINION, that the Chapel on the

---

\* For proof derived from its architecture, see note in a following page (23), and *Foote's Encyclopedia*, vol. 2, p. 923.

† This might be for the slain generally, or for Rutland, or for both.—*See Archaeol. vol. 13, p. 215.*



“ Bridge, at Wakefield, was first built and endowed as a memorial of the battle in which Richard, Duke of York, was slain :—‘ Item lego C sol ad confirmacio<sup>e</sup> cantarie in Capella S<sup>c</sup>e Mariæ sup Pont de Wakefield.’ However, there seems to be NO DOUBT that the present Chapel was erected UPON THAT OCCASION.”

It is generally very easy to account for such opinions, in politics, as Dr. Whitaker's, and that, with far greater appearance of probability than he has accounted for, those of General Lambert,\* as brave, generous, upright, and CONSISTENT, a character as is to be found in the history of mankind. A gentleman whose only offence is that he acted up to the illumination of the age, and the spirit of the times in which he lived—according to the dictates of his conscience, and the voice of his country. It is easy, I say, to account for the “ MILD” censure which Dr. Whitaker has passed upon him, and “ MILD” sentence which he has approved ; but that a learned and clever man, possessed too of his vast antiquarian knowledge, should, upon a matter of perfect indifference, and in which no prejudices are concerned, have remained inflexible against all reason and the evidence of well-known facts ; this, certainly, is a subject for wonder. It certainly was so when he wrote the *History of Craven* ; but still more so when he wrote upon Wakefield and its bridge Chapel ; because, then, his attention was particularly drawn to this remarkable curiosity, and his evidences were multiplied.

Connecting this note, therefore, with the extract from Dr. Whitaker's accounts of the West-Riding of Yorkshire,

---

\* If another, and larger work, which has long been ready for the press, should ever be published, the reader may find two reasons in it for my PARTICULAR regard to the memory of this most admirable man.

it seems quite manifest that he thought "St. Mary's Chapel," on Wakefield bridge, was built and endowed as a memorial of the battle of Sandal ; and that his reverence for Archbishop Holgate, as an infallible guide, was so great that he could not, or would not, be persuaded to the contrary.

I have stated it as my opinion, in a preceding page, that this chapel was not founded in honour of St. William, or on account of his miracle ; assigning, as one reason for it, the undoubted fact of its having been dedicated, either to St. Mary, or St. Anne ; but I think proper to let the reader know that whatever strength there may be in this as a general position, it is still open to attack. Commonly, as I take it, our ecclesiastical edifices were built in honour of that saint, to whom they were respectively dedicated ; but, certainly, not always ; as appears amongst others, in the instance of the Chapel, to the Archbishop's palace at York, built by Archbishop Roger, in honour of St. Sepulchre, but dedicated to "St. Mary and Holy Angels." As some, therefore, may be ready to throw out this objection, especially after being captivated by the excellent paper of Dr. Pegge, before mentioned, the reader will excuse me for making a few random observations connected with the subject.

When religious edifices were raised to the glory of the Supreme Being only (as was generally the case in early

---

Note referred to in page 20.

ORNAMENTS.—"The oak leaf, QUATREFOIL ROSES and CROCKETS "were exceedingly common, temp. Ed. 3. This reign forms a style— "The arch is sharp without curve—often moulded with oak leaves—rows "of small ornamented arches—niches and tabernacles with statues— "pinnacles not very lofty, but adorned with leaves, crockets, foliated "orbs, &c. This reign is deemed by men of the greatest taste and skill "the best era of this kind of architecture."—*Fosbroke* 92, 93.

times) and dedicated to the honour of some, supposed, divine personage, as the mother of Christ for instance: they generally, if not always, bore the name of that saint, to whom they were dedicated; but when they were built or founded in honour of some celebrated and less holy person, on account of a particular miracle, or act of goodness performed by that individual, and were dedicated as before mentioned, the case appears to have been otherwise. This may probably be illustrated by various instances besides the one adduced; but as the Chapel upon the bridge at York is a case in point, and one which also fortifies my first and chief position. I shall notice it more particularly than the other.

The reader will remember the supposed miracle of St. William in 1154, on the breaking down of Ouse Bridge, and may probably think, with me, that, on the re-building of it, a chapel would be founded to the honor of the Archbishop—The work appears to have been greatly aided by a brief, granted in 1235, by Walter Grey; and, about 33 years afterwards, an event happened whereby it was perfected. Leland in his "Collectanea," gives an account of a fray which happened upon Ousebridge, between the citizens of York and John Comyn, a Scotch nobleman, in which several of his servants were killed. "The citizens," says he, "were obliged to pay to the said Lord, three hundred pounds and to build a chapel on the place WHERE THE SLAUGHTER WAS MADE, and to find two priests to celebrate for the souls of the slain for ever."

Halfpenny in his "FRAGMENTA VETUSTA," makes these remarks upon the Chapel. "This entrance," says he, "with the arches and corbel, or bracket taken from the inside and represented in the frontispiece, are certainly

“ of an earlier date than the West end of the Chapel; and  
 “ it is probable a Chapel was built upon the bridge prior  
 “ to the dispute between John Comyn and the citizens,\* and  
 “ that the East end might have been an enlargement of the  
 “ old Chapel in the reign of King Henry 3d, when the  
 “ dispute happened—the style of architecture being of  
 “ that period. The Chapel continued until the reformation,  
 “ after which it was made the Exchange where the mer-  
 “ chants usually met every morning to transact business;  
 “ but on the decay of trade, it was disused, and is now  
 “ the Council Chamber of the city, near to which the  
 “ records are kept.

It appears, therefore, from this instance, that if a Chapel or Chantry were founded in honour of St. William, either on account of his miracle, or other meritorious acts, that Chapel, though dedicated to another Saint, would still be called “St. William’s Chapel.” The Chapel upon Ouse bridge has ever been called “St. William’s Chapel,” and the Chapel of the Archbishop’s palace, though dedicated to St. Mary, has ever been called “the Chapel of St. Sepulchre.” Taking these, therefore, for my guide, I am well assured that the Chapel upon the bridge at Wakefield, though certainly dedicated to St. Mary or St. Anne, would still have been called “St. William’s Chapel,” had it been erected in honour of him, and had he been constituted the patron Saint—as the tutelary genius of the banks of the Calder.

---

\* It may be useful here to note what is little known, namely, that there are three separate periods which may properly be called the three grand æra’s of church building, containing the TWELFTH, the SIXTEENTH, and the NINETEENTH centuries; but only one for Chantries, namely, the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

As to the evidence of St. William's being the patron Saint, arising out of the circumstance of his being found among the other images before alluded to, with a monk accosting him in words which refer to the miracle; I think it evidence of the slightest kind; for as well may St. Amphibalus,—St. John,—St. Polycarp,—or St. Ignatius, whose martyrdoms are represented in the same collection.—As well, I say, may any of these be taken for the patron Saint as St. William, for any thing which I have seen in print.

Respecting the images themselves, I know not what has become of them, but hope such real curiosities have not been destroyed. Dr. Pegge seems to have thought that they had lain concealed where found since the reign of Henry 8th, but he had, perhaps, better said, since the year 1549, for by referring to the act “for putting away “and abolishing of divers books and images,” 3 and 4 Edwd. 6, cap. 10, the information requisite upon this part of my subject may be gained. By section 2d, the reader will find it was enacted, “That if any person, or persons, “of what estate, degree, or condition, he, she, or they be, “bodie politic, or corporate, that then had, or thereafter “should have in his, her, or their custody, any of the “books or writings of the sorts described; or any images “of stone, timber, alabaster, or earth, graven, carved, or “painted, did not, before the last day of June then next “ensuing, deface and destroy, or cause to be defaced and “destroyed, the same images, &c. that, upon conviction, “he should, for the first offence, forfeit to the King, 20s. “and, for the second offence, four pounds, and, for the “third, should suffer imprisonment at the King's will.”—I have only to add, that from the last section of this act, it

appears that the images of reputed saints, such as those before mentioned, were particularly singled out for destruction.

Here then we see the time when these images would be first\* taken down and concealed in the false roof by the Catholics, under a hope, probably, of being restored under the reign of Mary. Whether upon her accession they were so restored must ever be doubtful; but, as the rood loft, crucifixes, and images re-appeared under her sway, it is not unlikely that these were again set up, and taken down for the last time, in the reign of Elizabeth. Be this as it may, they shew us, clearly, with what kind of representations both the interior and exterior of this Chapel would be ornamented.

Since the foregoing remarks were committed to paper, I have once more visited this interesting ruin, and seen, what I never saw before—its interior—which now is easily described. On entering it from the bridge, where now there is only one entrance, you may see a little plain room about the size of a good closet,—the other rooms on the same level are occupied by a corn-factor. Passing forward towards the north angle, before you can reach the† tower now inclosed by an apartment, some modern steps conduct you down into what formerly has been the dwelling of the priests, and extended all under the chapel, but now a small room perhaps nine feet square, out of which a door

---

\* “As for our churches,” says Harrison, “in 1577, they remain as in times past, save that all images, shrines, tabernacles, rood lofts, and monuments of idolatry are removed.”—*Description of Britain*, p. 77, 1st Edit.

† One of the uses of this tower, besides strengthening the bridge and chapel, has been perhaps for reception of articles by water. The pretty little spiral staircase from the bottom to the top is very striking, but very seldom observed, being now in part a coal hole.

way opens to the little garden and the river. Viewing the premises from this spot we perceive the bridge to be far more modern than the Chapel, and evidently built up to it—and, on close inspection, we see its masonry connected with a few courses of stone which have belonged to the first stone bridge; but too little of the latter remains to enable one to determine whether the Chapel has been incorporated and coeval therewith or not.

Returning to the interior we find that the Chapel has been completely gutted in the first instance, and afterwards, for the sake of a few pounds in rent, built up and partitioned in such a manner that not a vestige of its ancient beauty and form remains; and the liberties taken with its exterior seem nearly as barbarous. These are so humourously and well described by a writer in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, for 1809, that I cannot refrain from inserting his letter at full length.

“ Mr. Urban (says this Wakefield gentleman, under “ the signature of Archæus) I have constantly admired “ the zeal with which your correspondent ‘an Architect,’ “ pursues his examinations and descriptions of our ancient “ buildings, and have lamented, with him, the innovations “ which are made in those admirable relicks of antiquity, “ by men calling themselves architects. King Edward’s “ Chapel on Wakefield bridge, of which he speaks in such “ high and deserved terms of admiration,\* is, alas! a “ woeful instance of mutilation by these pretenders to “ architectural knowledge. He would wish were he to “ see it again, that it yet remained the shop of an old

---

\* The paper referred to may be found in the *Gent.'s Mag.* for 1806, p. 723, and is worthy of the readers attention.

" clothes-man or a den of flax-dressers. It is now cleared  
 " of its former occupiers and is used as a news-room—so  
 " far is it free from the pollution which he witnessed. But  
 " it has been repaired—REPAIRED? Yes, and in a truly  
 " Gothic style,—the beautiful tracery of the windows  
 " rarely to be equalled, is totally demolished—not a wreck  
 " is left behind, and its place is now supplied by cross-  
 " headed mullions filled up with spruce modern sash  
 " squares. What Goths some of these modern architects  
 " are! But the demon of innovation was not to be  
 " appeased with even such a sacrifice as this. Some other  
 " offering in defiance of taste was to be made. The front—  
 " that inimitable example of rich tracery and chaste orna-  
 " ment presented itself to the despoiler, and in order to give  
 " a finish, probably as he thought, to the dilapidated but-  
 " tresses, he propped them up with short, round pillars—  
 " four little, short, round, laughable things, all in a row!  
 " It is really too much for common sense to be so outraged;  
 " but I have no expectation of seeing a better knowledge  
 " of ancient architecture infused into the heads of many  
 " of our modern architects,\* although they have before  
 " their eyes the very examples which they ought to follow.  
 " When this is the case, every admirer of our ancient  
 " building, must tremble for their fate when they are to  
 " be repaired."

Quitting these just and melancholy reflections, I would  
 here return my thankful acknowledgments to a kind friend,  
 by whose researches I have been led to the knowledge of

---

\* It is still more grievous to see how some of the ornamental work has  
 been wantonly broken and thrown about by ignorant people. How  
 disgraced are we by a contrast with the French, in many more respects  
 than one!



the paper just mentioned. This has been peculiarly fortunate for me, not so much on account of what has been extracted, as of a note which "Archæus" has annexed to his letter, and which would have still more delighted me had I known of it sooner.

"Though this Chapel," says Archæus in his note, "is usually called King Edward 4th's Chapel, I am inclined to believe that both it and the ancient part of the present bridge, which 'an architect' says was built by Edward 4th, existed PREVIOUS to his reign; for I have in my possession a deed, dated 27th of September, 32 Henry 6th, charging an estate in Wakefield with the payment of 3s. in the following words, 'reddendo inde annuatim cantariæ sive Capellæ beatæ Mariæ scituat sup. Pontem Villæ de Wakefield tres Solidos Argenti ad tres Terminos; scilicet ad Festum Sancti Machalis, Purificationis beatæ, Mariæ et Pentecostes per æquales portiones.' I should be glad to know how much higher its antiquity has been traced."

Now then we are instructed by a document—valuable and decisive indeed. We find the Chapel was dedicated to the Virgin Mary, in opposition to the conjectures of those very learned, ingenious, and indefatigable Antiquaries—Pegge and Gough.—We find that it was (AS I CONJECTURED,) THE VERY CHAPEL AT WHICH KAYE AND BULL WERE CHAPLAINS.—We find that it was ENDOWED at sundry times, anterior to the battle of Sandal; and we thus learn how to appreciate the gossip and "hearsay" of

---

\* It appears that Leland knew nothing about the time when the vicarage at Wakefield was endowed, or the number of vicars which there had been, and was mis-informed as to these points.—See *Whitaker's Leeds*.

Leland," the "early and authoritative testimony" of Holgate, and the opinions of those who have taken their vague reports "upon trust."

Before I conclude my account of this Chapel I would just observe, that according to Gent, (who wrote very early in the last century), it was about nine yards in length within; and about six in breadth; and at this period, was converted into a sort of warehouse. It is the property, as I understand, of the county; and to its honor would still remain a lasting monument, if certain of the county monies were as tastefully, judiciously, and properly applied, as they might be, in the restoration of its ancient grandeur.

Another thing I would briefly hint at, is the several stages of degradation through which it has passed. Bereft of its images, appendages, and furniture within, and spoiled as to its statues, its pinnacles, and decorations without; it is highly probable that, sharing a similar fate to that on Ouse bridge, this charming\* structure at first became the exchange or rendezvous for mercantile men soon after the reformation; and like that also on the decay of trade at Wakefield, was either shut up, or used for a purpose very inferior to its original. We have seen that in Gent's time it was a warehouse—afterwards an old clothes shop, next a den of flax-dressers, and next a news-room. To this I can only add, that not many years ago it was a cheese-cake-house, and that now the only part not used as dwelling, is in the occupation of a respectable corn-factor!!!

---

\* "So much did the magick of this Chapel rivet my attention," says an artist, "that I passed three days making my sketches: indeed the nature of the work required so much of my feeble efforts."

What a crowd of ideas rush upon the mind in the contemplation of this chapel, and of its history ! Through what scenes ! What changes has it passed ! Here kings have stood, and may have bowed themselves before the King of kings ! Here nobles, and senators, and confessors, may have adored and wept ! Here many a holy and lovely devotee may have cast herself prostrate at the foot of the cross ! Here many an imposing spectacle has captivated the eye of the spectator—many a chaunt and requiem his ear—many a precept and example his heart !

Hail, venerable relic of an auspicious reign ! presented in thy infancy methinks, to the third Edward, and endowed by the fourth—both of them illustrious—Plantaganets too—the greatest line of princes, and (though cast into a dark and barbarous age) THE BEST that ever swayed the British sceptre ! Hail ! beautiful and interesting edifice ! beautiful even in thy old age and thy decay !—Though degraded under the sway of usurping “ Tudors,”—though neglected under that of despotic “ Stuarts”—though defiled by Jews and flax dressers, and mutilated by Goths and Vandals of later times, our posterity may yet see thee arising, like the Phoenix, from thy ruins, and if not consecrated afresh to religion, yet, at least, appropriated to literary and scientific studies.

## BUT WHY A CHAPEL UPON A BRIDGE?

SOME writers have derived the word Pontifex from sacrifices made upon bridges by the priests—a ceremony of the highest antiquity. These priests are said to have been commissioned to keep the bridges in repair as an indispensable part of their office.

Being thus consigned to the priests,\* there were Chapels annexed to them, on almost all our bridges of note, as at London, York, Durham, Rochester, and many other places, which I cannot now recollect or particularise. The most remarkable one, however, seems to have been at Droitwich, in Worcestershire, where the high road passed through the midst of the Chapel—the reading desk and pulpit being on one side, and the congregation on the other.

But bridge building ALONE, in the early ages, appears to have been regarded as an act of piety; and though generally carried on at the public expense, yet it was greatly facilitated by the donations and bequests of particular individuals.—In fact, however, like all our best national improvements, institutions, and structures, our great bridges were begun, completed, and supported, by “the people.”†

Nothing could be more crafty and politic than constituting the priests the toll takers upon these bridges. Being a

\* Peter ———, a priest, and chaplain of St. Mary, Colechurst, was the first person to whom was intrusted the building and care of the first stone bridge in London.

† The names of the benefactors to London bridge, for instance, were printed on a tablet, and hung up in St. Thomas's Chapel. The King's gift is said to have been, in fact, the gift of the people, being the produce of a tax on wool. Hence the tradition that “London Bridge was built on woolpacks.”

wily order of men—remarkable for their address and obsequiousness—for their influence over the public mind, and their intimacy with all classes. Being, moreover, the successors of St. Peter, and in possession too of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, who were so likely to be intrusted with the keys of the postern or barbican as they, who not only could give an agreeable ticket to the living, but a comfortable passport to the dead ?

But the priests appear to have taken an early leave of the bridges, and confined themselves to their chapels ; from which two certain inferences may be drawn. First, that the emoluments of toll collecting did not answer their expectations. And, secondly, that the office of collector and supervisor was by no means a “sinecure.”

Before we proceed further, it may be useful to notice briefly, and in due order as to time, the various means by which our bridges were in early times repaired and supported. These appear to have been 1st, by voluntary offerings on the spot ; 2dly, by donations raised by virtue of letters patent from the Crown, in the nature of church briefs. And here, in justice to the Roman Catholic clergy, I must remark they did some good to the county by active usefulness in soliciting these aids. 3dly, By tolls on horsemen and pack-horses passing the rivers, &c. 4thly, By rents reserved on letting spare ground upon the bridge, or waste ground near it, on building leases. 5thly, By grants of certain customs, payable in respect of goods and merchandise brought by water ; and 6thly, By devises, bequests, or conveyances of real or personal estates.

By all, or by some of these ways and means were most of the principal bridges of this kingdom repaired in early times. As to the smaller bridges which were sometimes built by

individuals of the royal family, or of the nobility, they had, commonly, lands, or rents, mills, or other property, annexed to them by their founders by way of\* endowment, and were conveyed and committed to the priests to be taken care of, in preference to the laity, for this ostensible reason, "Because it was believed that their repair and support " would be better done by religious men than by secular " persons, lest that such secular persons themselves, or " their heirs should, in the course of years, be wanting to " preserve them."

But the priests at the smaller bridges, as well as those at the larger, soon deserted their charges, and, what was worse, while attempting to throw the burden of their repairs upon the public, they stuck fast to the property, with which they were endowed†. This was an example too good to be lost upon Protestant "reformers," who with still greater adroitness, got rid of the incumbrances upon church property charged therewith, and having fixed these burdens on the "swinish multitude" have enjoyed the full income without fear or hazard—without litigation or dispute.

But to return to the chief bridges; the second reason for building chapels upon THEM appears to have been for strengthening them. This will appear manifest from the view of any of them with their Chapels; but in no instance

---

\* From the compotus of Bolton abbey it seems that one Eva de Land was a great benefactress to several bridges, but most of all to Bolton bridge, rebuilt probably with stone in 1314;—and though no mention is made of her views in this preference, I am persuaded it was on account of the chauntry which then was, or was intended to be annexed to it.

† See pleadings at Westminster, Easter Term, 6 Edward II. roll 95, and 48 Edward III. Mich. Term, roll 29. The former case, with what I have said, will be a tolerable key, perhaps, to the latter. I say "perhaps" because I am obliged to take the cases and authorities at second hand, and my authorities may be defective.

so much so, as where they were built like St. Mary's at Wakefield; that is to say, not in a line with the bridge, but like a buttress against it, to stem the violence of swelling floods. It is curious to observe how differently, according to circumstances, these bridge Chapels were placed for effecting so capital a purpose. Sometimes we find them at the centre of the bridge, like that of St. Thomas, upon old London bridge, which was incorporated with the tenth or great pier. Sometimes at the ends of the bridge, and abutting thereon as at Wakefield; and, sometimes, set upon the bridge, and in the line thereof, as in the instance of St. William's Chapel, at York, which would answer the design chiefly by its incumbent weight. Sometimes also they were built in, or incorporated, with the pier; and at other times were built upon it, and upon the platform of the bridge itself. I do not pretend to much architectural knowledge, but these are my thoughts arising from the observation of such bridge Chapels as I have seen myself, and of the descriptions and drawings of others.

The next step for strengthening the bridges over our chief rivers, and securing the passage to our chief cities, appears to have been the erection of defences thereon. On London bridge towers were placed not long after it was first built of stone. And as to Ousebridge, at York, which in Leland's time had six arches in it; he says there was thereon—besides a chapel—a town-hall, a guild, and an hospital. As to the former bridge (which was guarded at both ends) besides a most celebrated and curious house, called "Nonsuch House," there was almost a regular street upon it from one end to the other. But as to most of the smaller bridges they had merely Chapels upon them. Some

one, as in the instance of Wakefield, Rochester, Bolton-on-the-Swale, York, and, perhaps, Rotherham. Some two, as at Elvet bridge, over the Weer, in the county of Durham; and some three,\* as indeed there may have been at this bridge.

After being deserted by the priests, the bridges came to be superintended by bridge masters chosen from the laity, and the contributions for their maintenance became quickly more and more compulsory from this æra.

Next to the Chapels and towers or defences upon our bridges, appeared the prisons, the cage, or the stocks, for the safeguard, exposure, or punishment of malefactors; and at length on a few, hospitals,† guilds, houses, and lastly shops. These, however, were permitted for the sake chiefly of pecuniary supplies, and towards the maintenance of the bridge, at which tolls were often taken; and the chief entrance into our towns being over the bridge, the street was usually called Briggate.

In this place I must be permitted to notice some of the other uses to which our bridges were formerly converted, as the matter is rather curious. First, then, we find, that on all great occasions of rejoicing and triumph, their parapets were decorated with rich hangings of tapestry standards and cloth of gold. Pageants and processions also, were then conspicuous, and by them our Kings were welcomed into their chief towns and cities. Reflecting upon the magnificence of these spectacles, in connection with the bridges—their elegant chapels and other ornaments, our forefathers would, no doubt, be forcibly reminded of that

---

\* See Hone's *Table Book*, p. 413.

† The hospitals, fraternities, guilds, &c. were, of course, too good things to be neglected by so religious a King as Henry the 8th.



beautiful passage in the Psalms.—“There is a river, “the streams whereof shall make glad the city of our “God—the holy place of the tabernacles of the Most “High.”

Secondly, we find that, markets\* were often held upon bridges. The notices we have of these markets, are, however, so short and so uninteresting, that I shall pass them over with merely remarking, that even in our nearest market town—the town of Leeds—this relick of an ancient usage has been seen within the memory of man.

Thirdly, viewed in connection with trade, traffic, commerce, and the administration of justice, we see the reason why our ancestors chose this site in many instances for the foundation of a town’s hall, an exchange, a guild, an hospital, or a prison.

Fourthly and lastly, we find them used to exhibit spectacles of a very different and shocking kind, I mean the heads of criminals, or supposed criminals, which were often placed upon spikes or poles on bridges, in order that they might be seen both by land and water. I say supposed criminals, for many heads of holy martyrs—many heads of most learned, enlightened, and virtuous men, have been thus† exalted upon bridges in this kingdom, amongst

\* “In the domains of every lord, a toll was to be paid in passing his “bridge, or along his highway, or at his market.”—*Hallam’s View of the Middle Ages*, v. 2, p. 461.

† By one of the statutes of Edwd. 3d, passed in 1354, it was decreed that “no man of what estate or condition soever, should be put out of “land or tenement, nor taken, nor imprisoned, nor disinherited, nor put “to death, without being brought in answer by due process of law.” Little could this great prince have believed what was to happen near two CENTURIES afterwards, under a dynasty of usurpers. (*See also page 44.*)

the number of whom, More and Fisher are well known instances—and as to other criminals, or supposed criminals, where was there ever one who half so much deserved the axe or the halter, as that wretch who occasioned the murder of these holy saints, and who has left to posterity the character unique of having “spared no man in his anger, “or woman in his lust?”

From what has been written the reader, as I trust, will perceive, that Bridge Chapels were established for various purposes beyond what are generally known, and having now had their known uses laid before him, he will perhaps suspect, with me, that there were **OTHER** uses which our antiquaries have overlooked—People who have no antiquarian taste, no doubt, will rest perfectly satisfied with being told that they were founded as Chapels in which the Roman Catholic priests might perform obsequies for the souls of the departed; but the inquisitive “few”—they who resemble old Hutton, of Birmingham, and have but a portion of his “Tact,” will not be content with skimming over the surface of things in this way; but, surveying their subject with a microscopic curiosity, will make a halt at every remarkable object which presents itself to the eye, whether of the body or the mind.

In imitation of him, therefore, whom I most admire, I ask myself two more questions:—

**FIRST**,—For what particular purpose was that tower\* built which we perceive at the north east angle of the Chapel, and which rather disfigures it? And

---

\* “Low round keeps,” temp. EDWARD III. called “Round Tables.” *Fesbroke*, vol. 2, p. 923.

SECONDLY,—What need was there of two or more\* cantuarie priests to officiate here, when, if the duty was so trifling as is stated, one priest, alone, must have been sufficient?

The answer to these questions it is manifest can only be supplied by adverting to the state of the country and of the times in which the Chapel and first stone bridge at Wakefield were built—at least this was the idea which crossed my mind instantly, when first I thought upon the subject, and it affords me no ordinary gratification to say, that the opinion then formed, has been since established by evidence of another kind.

The learned reader will remember that for two centuries, or thereabouts, after the erection of this Chapel, the North of England, but more especially the county of York, presented one vast and gloomy aspect of forests and of waste, enlivened but in a small degree by towns or villages, or the labours of industry. Over these deserts a rugged and swampy bridle way, sometimes four feet in width, and never more than eight, conducted the traveller to the great metropolis of the kingdom.† It was indeed but a mere “pack and prime way,” never travelled by coaches or carriages, for they were unknown; never by carts‡ or wag-

\* There was in the Chapel of All Souls, at the bridge of Rochester, a chantry founded by Sir John Cobham, in 1397, for THREE chaplains to say masses for the soul of the founder, those of his family, and all the faithful departed.—*Archæol.* vol. 10, p. 344.

† See Hone's *Every Day Book*, vol. 1, p. 876.

‡ I have just discovered that upon very extraordinary occasions, (such as the removal of the furniture and goods of the royal household) Carts were employed so early as 1282, i. e. in Edward the 1st reign: and, what is very curious, that the CHAPEL of the King's Daughter Elizabeth (no doubt of Wood) was thus conveyed.—*Archæol.* v. 16, p. 71.

gons, for the former, if used at all, must have been confined to agricultural uses. No! it was frequented only by passengers on horseback or on foot—by men who conveyed their wares or merchandise on packages or packsaddles, and even their money in wallets, upon the backs of horses; and by pilgrims, mendicants, or other individuals, who, probably, put themselves in general under their protection. As to the nobility and great people in this country, they seldom attempted such a journey except in the height of summer or of autumn. Be it remembered too that in these dark and barbarous ages there was no post—no police—no information from the press—no houses of rest and refreshment, except at the religious houses and in the towns—not even a mile stone—and scarce a direction post along the whole line. Think too of the encouragement\* and protection afforded to outlaws, to robbers, and even to assassins, in these dark times, and then say if another reason may not be discovered for the foundation of Chapels on our chief bridges?

After what has been advanced it seems scarcely necessary to apprise the reader, that these religious edifices were not merely receptacles for devotional purposes, but for the rest—the refreshment—and security of the solitary and comfortless traveller. Here, when the Churches were shut up—when the monastic houses also were shrouded in darkness; the lights in the windows of the little chantry upon

---

\* I allude, especially, to "sanctuaries," which were countenanced from false notions and feelings of humanity—**FAR MORE EXCUSEABLE** and **TOLERABLE** however, than the sickly sensibility of the present day towards rogues and criminals.

the bridge, or the beacon or lantern\* of its little tower, would be, to him, unspeakably soothing and delightful. No doubt they would be of some use also to those who navigated the river, where that was navigable. This however is but matter of conjecture, while the other is a matter of fact.

Whatever then may have been said against the Catholics and their establishments, by Protestants, or Protestant reformers no better than themselves; this evidently was one of the benevolent and considerate institutions of their times in this country; and, of itself, proves what no man of learning can doubt—that even in ages when our ancestors were bound “in iron slumbers” by the magic spell of a superstition—baneful and stupid—there were still many who kept alive within their bosoms and their chapels, the sacred flame of christian charity.

Bolton bridge (says Dr. Whitaker) had, “anciently a “Chapel—like many others, FOR THE BENEFIT OF “TRAVELLERS;† of which the incumbent was undoubtedly “maintained by the prior and canons.” Whether they were obliged to do this by their stipulations with Eva de Land, or how otherwise, is immaterial and uncertain; but I am confirmed in my opinion by this extract, coupled with that which will appear presently.

I shall not expatiate on the blessings of repose, refreshment, assistance, and protection to the “houseless

\* On one or more of the Churches at York, but especially on the tower of one in the Pavement, a lantern with lights was kept to assist travellers on their way through the great forest of Galtres.

† “Wont to be visited a Peregrinis.”

*Leland.*

wanderer." It suits my fancy rather more to view the subject in another way—to consider, with those sentiments of liberality which every one ought to cherish, what have, probably, been the aspirations of many a pious and humble Catholic, when emerging from, or about to enter the "shades and solitudes profound," he has approached the Chapel of St. Mary, glimmering with its eastern cross.—Surely there is nothing far fetched in the supposition that such a one, with proper gratitude for the past, joy for the present, and confidence for the future, may have entered into the delightful musing of the son of Jesse. "The Lord is my Shepherd I SHALL NOT WANT. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures—he leadeth me beside THE WATERS OF COMFORT. He restoreth my soul—he leadeth me in THE PATHS OF RIGHTEOUSNESS for his name's sake.—Yea ! THO' I WALK THROUGH THE VALLEY OF THE SHADOW OF DEATH\* I will fear no evil, for thou art with me—thy ROD and thy STAFF they comfort me."

ONE general annexation to chantries, says Fosbroke, was an anniversary festival—it was a Romish fashion—brought (says Ovid) into Italy by Æneas. The Roman "divisiones" were doles, or donations to the poor, upon anniversaries; and Suetonius says (c. 26) that Cæsar first instituted feasts to the people upon the death of his daughter. Lyndwood notes "the anniversary implied the office, not only at the end of the year, BUT EVERY DAY THROUGHOUT THE YEAR." The word also signified a

---

\* It is quite certain, though contrary to what is generally asserted and believed, that even wolves were not quite extinct in this country, in the early part of the fourteenth century, 1305, "Cuidam qui Occidit Lupum." *Clifford's Household Book.*

yearly distribution made to clerks on the day of the consecration of a bishop, abbot, &c. The "month's mind" was a monthly solemnity of the same kind, attended, in Ireland, with invitations to the gentry and clergy; masses said for the deceased in all parts of the house at once—FEASTINGS and LARGESSES. The "trental," an office for the dead, which consisted of thirty day's masses; was first founded by Gregory the great, in substitution for Ossian's "Song of the bards," "which ROSE OVER THE DEAD"—an accompaniment of the Irish howl.\*

Another species of endowment to chantries were the "Give Ales," or bequests to the lights or altar of a saint, with direction for singing masses at the obit, trental, or anniversary of the death of the testator; and lands were settled for the perpetual payment of the legacies so appropriated. But these "Give Ales" were also charitable bequests, and also for convivial purposes,† but being blended with notions and practises of a superstitious nature, they were, under that pretext, swallowed up and done away with,

\* Upon the testimony of two very respectable and well informed gentlemen, whom I had the pleasure to meet at Harrogate last summer, I take leave to correct the general notion here prevalent, as to the "Irish howl;" and to say, that it is—amongst the better classes in Ireland—a very affecting solemnity.

† I never can help regretting that many, even among the best of men—the early Puritans—should, in their heat against the Catholic church, not only have been insensible to the excellency of some of its institutions, but even of certain doctrines of that church, perhaps quite as scriptural, and certainly far more rational and consolatory than some of the tenets of Calvin, at least, they were quite as favourable to good morals.

As to ancient Pastimes and Amusements generally.—I lately discovered a Pearl in an Ocean of Mud, and shall perhaps present it to the Public in another Work.

under the st. 1st, Edw. the 6th, ch. 14. *See also Archaeologia*, vol. 12, p. 15.

“Some deductions also” says Fuller in his church history, “were made by the will of the founders, to uses merely charitable, and no-wise superstitious, out of the surplusage of the charity lands (the priests being first paid) as for the necessary relief of poor persons, and breeding poor scholars for the universities.” But as the stork in the fable, found among the cranes in destroying the corn of the husbandman, in vain pleaded his own piety to his parents—being killed for company sake with those birds among whom he was caught; so, it is more than suspicious that these pious uses were utterly extinguished at the suppression of abbeys, to teach men’s charities hereafter to beware of too familiar intercourse with superstition!!!

It is, indeed, “more than suspicious” that these pious uses were extinguished at the suppression of the abbeys; for this very Mr. Fuller puts that matter out of all doubt, by what he tells us in the sequel—and a pretty sequel it is:—I have not the book at hand to set down exactly his words, but the substance is, that after the seizure, the plunder and distribution of the great monastic property—the little chantries\*—the sad remains of what had been bestowed upon the public, and the poor especially, were in like manner wrested from them, and given to those loyal and courtly gentlemen, who assisted the despot in this RELIGIOUS CONCERN.† Fuller indeed acknowledges that

\* 37 Henry VIII. ch. 4. 1 Edward VI. ch. 14.

† “Vast was the wealth accruing to the Crown by the dissolution of “chantries.”—*Fuller*, 353, 354.



they were considered as "THE CHEESE," or last crumbs of the banquet; but, at all events, they were swallowed by these cormorants without either hesitation or compunction, affording to mankind a lesson very different to that abominable gloss which he has given it, namely:—the vast importance of a constitution formed by proper authority, and settled and defined on parchment—of protecting laws, and of a good government.

Having now put into something like order, all my thoughts, collections, and recollections, upon the subject of our ancient bridge Chapels, and their bridges, and having no motive for saying more upon the subject, than properly belongs to it, I will conclude.

If any person who may have read the various publications of old Hutton, of Birmingham ————Delightful books!\* If any one, I say, who has read these shall give me credit for possessing, (with kindred feelings and sentiments) but a small portion only of his "Tact," be that my reward for the little trouble of a few days. As to any comparison with that venerable man, in many respects, I have not the vanity to affect it.—But surely it may be allowed to a brother antiquary to follow, at an humble distance, that fine example which he has left us.

---

\* I allude especially to his "Battle of Bosworth Field," "History of the Roman Wall," "Trip to Coatham," and "Memoirs of his own Life." If any person can read the last without being much affected by it, let him beware of the traitor in his own bosom.

## APPENDIX.

---

Mr. Gough says "that a perspective view of Edward the 4th's Chapel was drawn and published by George Fleming, painter, in Wakefield; engraved by Toms, 1743; and was in possession of Fleming's widow, who resided there in 1777; but that there is a better view of it, by Lodge, in Thorseby's Ducatus."—p. 164.

The engravings of it after drawings by Cawthorne, about 1800, are well known.

That the Chapel may be viewed on every side I have fixed upon the view hereunto annexed. It certainly displays it to the least advantage, but then it illustrates my argument better than the other views. It is hoped the reader will bear in mind that the windows, mullions, and tracery of them, is modern.

Since writing this treatise, I have seen Mr. Chantrell, the Architect, who allows me to say, he quite coincides in my opinion, and thinks the Chapel was built about 1340. The **KNOTTED**, crocketed, oak leaf is, I believe, the best criterion in an architectural view.

There is a very ancient building at the North end of the bridge, and on the same side as the Chapel, which, no doubt, has belonged thereto, and probably has once been the house at which tolls were received: but not having seen its interior, I am doubtful for what purpose it was built

The inquisitive reader who would wish to form a partial knowledge of what "St. Mary's" has been internally ; and (as to its windows), externally, will thank me for referring him to the Chapel of Prior Crawden, at Ely—described in the 14th vol. of the *Archæologia*, page 108, and built between the years 1321 and 1340. To me the similarity appears so striking, that I, almost, am persuaded they were built by the same architect—Alan de Walsingham.—For the sake of those who may not be able to refer to that work, and on account of the similar fate of the two Chapels, I make the following abstract :—

" This Chapel (Prior Crawden's) at present is converted  
" into a dwelling-house—the height being divided into two  
" floors, and length into two apartments and a passage.

" The North side of the Chapel, as far as the altar, has  
" been faced with brick for the insertion of chimnies. It  
" is divided into four compartments by clustered columns,  
" which support the ceiling.

" One remarkable singularity of this Chapel is its being  
" raised UPON A CRYPT, the floor of which is nearly upon a  
" level with the surrounding ground. The entrance is to the  
" West. The entrance to the Chapel is by a staircase which  
" winds within the buttress, at the NORTH EAST corner.  
" The floor of the Chapel is Mosaic.

" The ceiling was stone groined, supported by clustered  
" columns. The walls were ornamented with a double  
" niche, decorated richly with small columns, pinnacles,  
" crockets, &c. In the lower niche the wall was perforated  
" for a small window ; the upper had numerous figures, and  
" on a supported pedestal, was originally placed a figure.

" The East window is divided, the arch pointed, the  
" mullions and the tracery still beautifully perfect.

“ The Crypt has nothing remarkable in it, being merely  
“ a plain groined ceiling, supported by plain columns, and  
“ lighted by a lancet-shaped window.”

I particularly recommend to the reader's notice the views of this Chapel, especially *pl.* 24, being the elevation of the EAST END of the Prior's Chapel. How far the similitude may hold good internally, I am prevented from stating, by walls, by underdrawing, and every kind of obstacle, at Wakefield.

N S.

































































































































































DO NOT CIRCULATE